Remarks

This communication is considered fully responsive to the Office Action. Claims 1-5, 10-13, and 16-21 were examined. Claims 1-5, 10-13, and 16-21 stand rejected. No claims are currently amended. No claims are currently canceled. No new claims are currently added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview

Applicant's attorney, Mr. Trenner, appreciates the time the Examiner afforded on the telephone on August 14, 2008 to discuss this case. During the telephone interview, Mr. Trenner explained how the claim recitations differentiate over the cited reference to Hemstreet. In particular, Hemstreet shows printer status in "user-friendly" format in Figure 2 and requires a translation by status server 109 in the embedded server 107 at the printer 105. The Examiner noted that he would need time to consider the claim recitations and the cited reference. Mr. Trenner offered to file a written response for the Examiner's consideration and the Examiner agreed that he would call Mr. Trenner after reviewing the written response if further claim amendments were necessary to put the claims in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 10-13, and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,931,447 to Hemstreet, et al. ("Hemstreet"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites "displaying a list of selectable printer status objects on a display device in a remote client in data communication with a printer, where a name of each of the printer status objects is displayed in a printer management language native to the printer." Independent claims 10, 16, 20, and 21 include similar recitations. Hemstreet does not teach or suggest at least these recitations.

The Office Action relies on Figure 2 in Hemstreet as showing selectable printer status objects. Figure 2 shows a web page 200 such as may be displayed in Internet Browser 119 at the clients 11 in Figure 1A). See, e.g., Hemstreet at col. 7, lines 47-50 and 60-64. The selectable printer status objects are shown in Figure 2 as, for example, 'Ink Low' and 'Out of Paper'. Clearly these are displayed in 'user-friendly' format, and not displayed in a printer management language native to the printer.

Instead, the Office Action relies on the status server 109 in Hemstreet using a Printer Management Language (PML) (col. 6, lines 58-67). However, the status server 109 is in the server 107 which is embedded in the printer 105. See, e.g., Figure 1B in Hemstreet, and col. 6, lines 17-20. In Hemstreet, the status objects being displayed at the client 111 (Figure 2) are selected and then sent to the server 107 (see, e.g., col. 7, lines 60-67). The status server 109 transposes device specific language, e.g., HP-PML

formatted device driver, into a PML language for use by the other Server 107 components." Hemstreet at col. 6, line 65 to col. 7, line 1.

Therefore, Hemstreet cannot be fairly interpreted as displaying a list of selectable printer status objects on a display device in a remote client in data communication with a printer, where a name of each of the printer status objects is displayed in a printer management language native to the printer.

As previously noted by Applicant, displaying the status objects in a printer management language eliminates the need for translation between user-friendly terms and printer management language terms that are usually stored in management information bases associated with printers (e.g., as is the case in Hemstreet). Thus, the remote printer management system 133 executed on a remote device is more simple and smaller as it does not need to account for translation between printer management language terms and user-friendly terms. Similarly, such functionality is also not needed in the printer. Accordingly, typical calls to printers to obtain status objects and other information may be employed without making changes to the printers, thereby enabling the functionality for legacy equipment.

Applicant notes the 'Response to Arguments' section on page 6 of the Office Action. However, Applicant believes the claims fairly distinguish over the cited passage from Hemstreet for the reasons discussed above. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-listed attorney if further amendment to the claim is believed necessary in order to expedite allowance of this case.

10

For at least the foregoing reasons claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the cited references and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-5 depend from independent claim 1; claims 11-13 depend from independent claim 10; claims 17-19 depend from independent claim 16. Each of the independent claims is believed to be allowable. Therefore, each of the dependent claims are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the respective independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Mark D. Trenner/

Dated: __August 14, 2008__   By: _____

Mark D. Trenner
Reg. No. 43,961
(720) 221-3708